

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,918	07/05/2005	Todd Stout	67101-002	2982
26996 7590 03/10/2009 CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C. 400 WEST MAPLE ROAD			EXAMINER	
			ASTORINO, MICHAEL C	
SUITE 350 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3769	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/524,918	STOUT, TODD	
Examiner		Art Unit	
Michael C. Astorino		3769	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. Mar her ply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal (e)th oppeal replies) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any amend patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70(4).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

- The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for speak and/or
 - appeal; and/or

 (d) ☒ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

- 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- 5 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): ______.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
- non-allowable claim(s).

 7. ⊠ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ⊠ will not be entered, or b) □ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) rejected: 1-32, 34-36, and 38-46.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 OFR 1.116(e).
- 9. I The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. \(\bigcirc \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other:

/Michael C. Astorino/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3769 Continuation of 3, NOTE: Claims 47-52 have been added without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims,

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the prior at teaches the claimed features. Applicant has alleged in the most recent response that the disclosure of Blants et al. fails to anticipate the claim direvention. However, Blants et al. uses of the word "symptoms", which is the plural form of symptom. Furthermore, "symptoms" relates to multiple and different symptoms as well. As such it is the Examiner's position that "symptoms" as read in light the specification is sufficient to reject the claimed invention. In other words the Examiner's burden, "preponderance of the evidence", is met and has not been croome by the Applicant. Additionally, the Examiner has been able to assert this position, i.e. Blants et al. being anticipatory of the claims, in large part because the Applicant's claims are broad. To that end it is the Examiner's position that the applicant could amend over the prior art so that Blants et al. could no longer be applied and the rejection would be withdrawn. For example, by stating the type of symptoms that are monitored; especially those symptoms that are not related to asthma.